

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the specification due to informalities. Applicant has amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner to fully respond to the Examiner's objection. More specifically, the fourth paragraph on Page 5 and the first paragraph on Page 13 has been amended removing "is" to correct the typographical errors. The paragraph beginning on line 16 of Page 14 has been amended to correct the misspelling of "thermal". The paragraph beginning on line 5 of Page 15 has been amended replacing "collect" with --collected-- to correct the grammar of the sentence. The paragraph beginning on line 13 of Page 15 has been amended to correct "past" to --paste--, a typographical error. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his attention to detail.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 3 and 4 for informalities. Claims 3 and 4 have been appropriately amended to fully respond to and comply with the Examiner's objections. In line 6 of Claim 3, "a" has been changed to --an--, line 3 Claim 4 the spelling of "boars" has been corrected to --boards--, line 6 of Claim 4 the spelling "operative" has been corrected to --operatically--. The Examiner has objected to Claim 7 for not complying with the written description requirement. Applicant has amended his Claim 7 to fully respond to and comply with the Examiner's objection.

Examiner has rejected Claim 2 "under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Theobald et al, (U.S. Patent 5,567,036)." Theobald teaches a clearance and aside marker lamp for trucks and other vehicles. Applicant has amended his Claim 2 in order to respond fully to the Examiner's rejection and to differentiate the present invention from that taught by the Theobald patent. Theobald teaches the use of a "truck power source 212" (See Col. 7, line 15). Implicit is such identification is the use of a DC current source. The present invention utilizes an alternating power source with a conversion to direct current. Theobald does not teach the use of a converter to convert alternating current to direct current. The present invention teaches the use of either alternating current or direct, whereas the Theobald patent teaches the use of direct current, only.

The Examiner rejects Claim 1 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verdes et al. (U.S. Patent 6425678) in view of Glover et al. (U.S. Patent 6104611)", Claim 3 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theobald et al. (U.S. Patent 5567036) as applied to Claim 2 above, and further in view of Verdes, et al (U.S. Patent 6425678)", and Claims 4-7 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verdes et al. (U.S. Patent 6425678) in view of Glover et al. (U.S. Patent 5567031 [sic. 6,104,611])".

Verdes and Glover each contain some of the teachings of the present invention, so the question arises as to whether the two prior art pieces were properly combined. In general, prior may be combined if their teachings could be included together. As in the case of Verdes teaches a lamp that does not have the thermally conductive L-shaped brackets. Glover does teach such L-shaped brackets. However, Glover teaches the L-shaped brackets used in conjunction with a heat pipe (#50, Fig. 1) and a phase changing material (#60, Fig. 1). Nothing in the Verdes patent teaches the use of any type of heat pipe or phase change material, nor does the Verdes patent imply that such an application might be possible. Glover also teaches a heat flow that moves both in and out of a component from the heat pipe and the phase change material. The Glover device is configured to provide for the removal of heat, as well as providing a source of heat, for the components. The present invention does not teach a bidirectional heat flow, but rather teaches a single direction of heat flow, away from the components.

The Verdes patent teaches a single direction of heat flow, contrary to the Glover patent, therefore, the two patents should not be combined in that they teach away from each other. Also, it would not have been obvious to include the heat pipes and phase change material of the Glover invention with the Verdes

patent teachings, as there is nothing in the Verdes patent to imply that such a configuration might be possible.

As to Claim 3 and the combination of Verdes with Theobald, it should be noted that Theobald implicitly is limited to the use of direct current. Verdes, to the contrary, utilizes alternating current to power that invention (See Column 3, line 30). Because Verdes and Theobald each utilized a different type of current, they are not combinable. The present invention utilizes a hybrid of the two, using alternating current with a converter to produce direct current. Neither Theobald nor Verdes teach or even suggest the conversion of one form of current source into another type of current source.

As to Claims 4 through 7, Claim 4 has been amended to include the limitation of having an alternating current supply being converted to a direct current to power the device. Such a configuration is neither taught nor suggested by either Verdes or Glover. In addition, the Verdes patent and the Glover patent should not be combined in that the teachings of the two devices are exclusive of one another in that Glover teaches a sink and source model, whereas Verdes does not have that combination, but teaches a single sink configuration. Neither Glover nor Verdes teaches a system that takes an alternating current and converts it to a direct current.

The Applicant submits that the foregoing amendments and remarks distinguish the present invention from the prior art. The Applicant also submits that the foregoing is fully responsive to all of the Examiner's objections and rejections. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and objections and pass this application forward to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward P. Dutkiewicz,
Reg. 46,676
640 Douglas Avenue
Dunedin, FL 34698
Telephone: (727) 734-2855
Facsimile: (727) 734-2750